DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 256 108 EC 172 506

AUTHOR Baca, Leonard
TITLE Teacher Education Programs.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 24p.; In: Chinn, Philip C., Ed. Education of Culturally and Linguistically Different Exceptional Children. Reston, Virginia, ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children/Council for Exceptional Children, 1984. Chapter 5. For complete monograph, see EC 172 501.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; Competency Based Teacher Education; *Cultural Differences; *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; *Limited English Speaking; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

The recent history of bilingual special education teacher training is discussed, and specific examples are cited of the need for cross-cultural skills which are found neither in bilingual/bicultural education nor in special education but are vital to working with culturally and linguistically different exceptional (CLDE) students. General and specific competencies for bilingual special educators are listed for the areas of instruction/curriculum, assessment and evaluation, classroom management, counseling, advocacy/public relations, and research. Characteristics of current teacher training programs are described. Five conditions are cited as being necessary to institutionalize bilingual special education as a regular part of college or university program offerings. Two model training programs are described--The Multicultural Institute for Change and the Bilingual Language Learning System (BLDS). Among recommendations are that curricula should be highly interdisciplinary, and that bilingual special education teacher competencies identified as critical by practitioners should be validated empirically before being used to design future training programs. (JW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED256108

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

CHAPTER 5

TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Leonard Baca

One of the greatest priorities for educators is the task of providing the most appropriate and effective educational programs and experience for various student populations. Up to the present time, one population of students that has been largely ignored has been the exceptional bilingual. In this paper, exceptional and handicapped are used interchangeably. "Exceptional" includes students who are handicapped in a variety of ways: the mentally retarded, the learning disabled, the emotionally disturbed, the physically handicapped, and the visually and hearing impaired. In addition to these handicapping conditions, however, bilingual exceptional students come from culturally and linguistically different backgrounds and have not acquired proficiency in the English language. This population may be best described as culturally and linguistically different exceptional students (CLDE). Although the actual number of CLDE students is not known, an estimate of this number was obtained during a 1976 national study concerning the overlap of identified Title I students and Title VII students. According to the results of the study, approximately one-half million students aged 5 to 21 years were handicapped and from non-English language backgrounds (National Center for Educational Statistics, 1980).

To teach these students in the language they can best understand is to build on their linguistic and cultural strengths and is compatible with sound educational practice. During the past 50 years, a great deal of emphasis has been placed on the education of handicapped students through various special education programs. This movement reached its peak in 1974, with the passage of P.L. 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act. The education of handicapped children continues to be a strong national priority. Even more recently, within the past 15 years, there has been a renewed interest in bilingual education. The United States Congress passed the Bilingual Education Act (P.L. 90-247) in 1968. This act made it possible for local school districts to receive federal funding for the implementation of bilingual programs designed to meet the needs of students with limited English proficiency.

EC 17 2526

Recent developments in litigation and educational research dealing with handicapped children of limited English proficiency suggests that educators must seriously address the issues related to designing and implementing bilingual special education programs. One of the most critical needs in this overall national effort is to prepare a cadre of high-quality, trained, bilingual special education teachers who will be able to provide the necessary educational experiences that will assist these students in developing to their fullest potential.

Any discussion of bilingual special education teacher training should occur within the broader context of multicultural education. In 1979, multicultural teacher training was formally institutionalized by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). This influential accreditation agency adopted a multicultural education policy statement which requires all teacher training programs to include a multicultural component. Since this requirement is relatively new, many schools of education are still in the beginning stages of planning and implementing the component. With time and careful implementation this requirement will have a significant impact on teacher preparation programs. At the heart of multicultural education is the concept of cultural pluralism. Advocates of this concept endorse the principle that there is no model American. Cultural pluralism not only appreciates but promotes cultural diversity. It recognizes the unique contributions of various cultural groups that have strengthened and enriched our society.

Ten years ago the Commission on Multicultural Education of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education also adopted an important policy statement. One of the paragraphs of this statement is particularly significant. It reads as follows:

> To endorse cultural pluralism is to endorse the principle that there is no one model American. To endorse cultural pluralism is to understand and appreciate the differences that exist among the nation's citizens. It is to see these differences as a positive force in the continuing development of a society which professes a wholesome respect for the intrinsic worth of every individual. Cultural pluralism is more than a temporary accommodation to placate racial and ethnic minorities. It is a concept that aims toward a heightened sense of being and wholeness of the entire society based on the unique strength of each of its parts. (AACTE, 1973, p. 264)

Bilingual special education teacher training is one strategy for promoting cultural pluralism in our schools. More importantly, it is an effort designed to promote equal educational opportunity for limited-English-proficient students who are also handicapped.

As an emerging discipline, bilingual special education draws heavily from both bilingual education and special education. Both of these fields have been very actively involved in teacher training activities

for many years. Bilingual special education teacher training, however, requires much more than the borrowing of courses from each of the parent disciplines. Bilingual special education requires a carefully articulated and planned convergence of these two disciplines which results in a new and unique body of knowledge.

RECENT HISTORY OF BILINGUAL SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER TRAINING

The problem of preparing high-quality teachers, teacher trainers, and other leadership personnel in this specialized area is not new and has already been addressed by the Office of Special Education as well as by a few universities and colleges throughout the country.

In 1978, the Bureau for the Handicapped of the Department of Education, cognizant of the scarcity of qualified bilingual/bicultural personnel, took steps to correct the situation. Through its Hispanic initiative, which was later extended to other linguistically and culturally different groups as well, the bureau encouraged the establishment of personnel preparation programs which would both recruit and train bilingual/bilcultural professionals to work with CLDE students. In 1979, an initial group of 22 personnel preparation programs were funded under this initiative. Since then, the number has increased annually. Thus, while there were a few programs functioning prior to the initiative, in a real sense the preparation of personnel to work with CLDE began in 1979. As in any new field, there is a need to identify, define, and improve current practices.

In the spring of 1980 and again in the spring of 1981, professionals engaged in preparing personnel to work with CLDE students met in the Washington, D.C. area in workshops sponsored by ACCESS, INC., and funded by the Department of Education. Some of the purposes of the two workshops were to define the field, determine the competencies which should be required of both trainers and trainees, and share ideas about philosophies and methodology. According to Grossman (1982), one of the results of these workshops was an agreement to replace the term bilingual special education with the term "the education of culturally and linguistically different exceptional students," a phrase which emphasizes cultural as well as linguistic differences. It was also agreed that persons preparing to work with such students need to have the skills included in the field of bilingual/bicultural education, special education, and a third group of cross-cultural "convergent" skills which were not found in either but are vital to working with CLDES.

Three examples of the need for the third component follow. In the area of assessment, bilingual/bicultural educators may receive training in the assessment of language dominance and proficiency. They may also be prepared to assess and develop academic readiness and achievement in both their students' first and second languages. As one aspect of their training, special educators are prepared to assess academic proficiency in language arts and assess and remediate learning disabilities involving language development using instruments and procedures developed for

English-speaking acculturated monocultural students. However, neither the bilingual/bicultural educator nor the special educator is trained in the assessment and development of language when this development is impaired in some manner and the child is not from an English-speaking home. Persons who complete both a bilingual/bilcultural training program still will not be equipped to use culturally and linguistically appropriate special education assessment and instructional procedures with non-English-speaking CLDES.

In the area of counseling, counselors who work with students are trained to determine when their counselee's problems are intrinsically or extrinsically caused. When the cause of the students' problems are intrinsic (within the students) they may try to help the students accept the responsibility, blame, and guilt for their actions, and/or help them believe that they can control their own lives. When the causes are extrinsic (outside the students) they may encourage the students to assert themselves, to use methods to change their environments, or not to assume responsibility and guilt for things which may be beyond their control. When CLDES react to prejudicial treatment and cultural conflicts by withdrawing or rebelling, counselors who are unaware of the prejudices and cultural conflicts which these students face may assume that the cause of their behavior is intrinsic. As a result, they may use techniques design to change the students' shy or agressive personalities instead of using techniques to help them deal more effectively with a hostile or insensitive environment.

As a final example, teachers or counselors who are unaware that in some cultures it is a sign of disrespect to express a lack of understanding or a difference of opinion may believe that students or parents who politely act as if they understand and agree actually do understand and accept the suggestions made to them. In fact, they may neither agree nor understand. This type of cross-cultural misunderstanding can have serious consequences in assessment, instruction, and parent involvement.

Having identified these three groups of competencies, those included in bilingual/bilcultural education, those included in special education, and those convergent/cross-cultural abilities not included in either of the two traditional fields, the participants in the ACCESS workshops enumerated specific competencies within each of these three components which should characterize both trainers and well prepared trainees. When the trainers evaluated themselves, it was clear that, with very few exceptions, they had not acquired all of these competencies. Typically, trainers had been trained in either bilingual/bicultural education or special education, but not in both, and not in convergent skills. Those few who were trained in both areas tended to lack some of the cross-cultural competencies not included in either area; each trainer had his or her strengths and weaknesses. It becomes clear that a number of models of personnel preparation were being used.

It is also interesting to note that there was a significant difference between the mean responses of the bilingual directors as compared to the special education directors on 15 of the 27 competency

items. In general, the bilingual directors rated the importance of using the native language and culture as well as ESL methodology and parental involvement significantly higher than the special education directors.

A careful review of several competency-related studies indicates that there are certain competencies that are repeatedly ranked as very important by multiple sources. In other words, there seems to be consensus in the literature that the following are the most important general competencies for bilingual special educators.

1. The desire to work with the CLDE student.

2. The ability to work effectively with parents of CLDE students.

3. The ability to develop appropriate IEP's for the CLDE student.

4. Knowledge and sensitivity toward the language and the culture of the group to be served.

5. The ability to teach ESL to CLDE students.

6. The ability to conduct nonbiased assessment with CLDE students.

7. The ability to use appropriate methods and materials when working with CLDE students.

The most detailed and specific set of competencies that have been developed are compatible with the most frequently cited generic competencies listed above. These very specific competencies were prepared by an expert panel of bilingual special education teacher trainers convened by the Association for Cross-Cultural Education and Social Studies (ACCESS) (Pynn, 1981). These competencies are as follows:

I. Instruction/Curriculum

A. The trainee is knowledgeable about general cultural characteristics:

1. Lifestyles of ethnic minority populations, family structure, and community support systems.

2. Attitudes and behaviors of cultural and socioeconomic groups.

B. The trainee understands the relevance of child-rearing practices of ethnic minority families to the CLDE child's cognitive, emotional, and social development.

C. The trainee is aware of cultural conflicts resulting from ethnic minority differences that may affect the CLDE child's self-image and thus influence his or her emotional and social development.

D. The trainee institutes a teaching process that takes into account the impact of cultural conflicts on the CLDE child's academic performance.

E. The trainee understands the acculturation process of culturally diverse individuals into the mainstream of American society.

F. The trainee implements techniques to facilitate the integration of the CLDE child into American schools and society.

G. The trainee develops and implements appropriate educational programs to meet the special needs of the CLDE children.

H. The trainee develops educational programs, designed to improve the bilingual development of learning disabled children, which reflect an understanding of current approaches in the field.

I. The trainee plans, designs, and implements special education programs for CLDE populations in accordance with legislative requirements and guidelines.

J. The trainee will plan, design, and implement individualized education programs which include, where appropriate, such subject areas as: language arts, arithmetic, science, social studies, vocational skills, and physical education.

K. The trainee develops and applies appropriate educational methods based, in part, upon diagnostic results.

L. The trainee demonstrates skill in developing and/or adapting educational materials and procedures to meet individual needs.

M. The trainee works in cooperation with other education professionals to design a full-service educational program appropriate to the needs of students exhibiting specific handicaps, gifts, or talents.

N. The trainee designs curriculum and instructional programs that are based on behavioral objectives considering cultural variables.

O. The trainee directs and organizes program activities in cooperation with parents, teachers, and other school personnel.

P. The trainee determines the appropriate instructional setting to maximize the educational development of the CLDE child.

II. Assessment and Evaluation

A. The trainee recognizes normal language development patterns.

B. The trainee is knowledgeable about major empirical research in the area of speech and language acquisition.

C. The trainee explains the effects of anatomic, physiologic, linguistic, psycholinguistic, and sociolinguistic factors on the communication process.

D. The trainee differentiates between those difficulties arising from second language acquisition and those from speech and language disability.

1. Trainee distinguishes between culturally derived linguistic conventions and deviant language development problems.

2. Trainee understands the nature, etiologies, and remedial techniques associated with language disorders.

E. The trainee writes descriptive reports which accurately reflect the nature of communicative disorders.

F. The trainee demonstrates the ability to assess student strengths and needs within the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains through the use of appropriate formal and informal instruments and procedures (e.g., standardized tests, commercially prepared informal tests, teacher-prepared measures, and criterion-referenced measures).

G. The trainee is aware of the uses and limitations of current standard assessment techniques in regard to CLDE populations.

H. The trainee develops an assessment model based on information gained from several sources. For example:

1. Anecdotal records and pupil behavior scales.

2. Observations and recommendations from parents, teachers, and other school personnel.

I. The trainee is able to assess those factors limiting the participation of the family in the school setting and set specific goals.

J. The trainee formulates an accurate description of student ability based upon observation of academic performance in light of the CLDE student's cultural background.

K. The trainee is aware of the influence of learning styles, cultural values, and language patterns of ethnic and minority groups on classroom and test performance.

L. The trainee administers appropriate language assessment instruments and accurately interprets the skills measured and the information obtained.

M. The trainee uses the information gained to determine the CLDE student's most appropriate and least restrictive educational setting.

N. The trainee uses a cognitive style analysis approach as a diagnostic-prescriptive tool.

O. The trainee will write a diagnostic evaluation in behavioral terms.

P. The trainee will analyze skills and educational materials through the task analysis approach to determine program effectiveness.

Q. The trainee develops and applies appropriate educational methods based, in part, upon diagnostic results.

R. The trainee determines the appropriate instructional strategies used in diagnostic-prescriptive teaching of the CLDE child.

S. The trainee develops techniques to improve communication competence within the classroom.

1. Trainee understands the function of language in the classroom as it relates to educational development.

2. Trainee develops alternative techniques to improve specific speech and language skills of CLDE children.

T. The trainee implements the appropriate strategies for the diagnostic-prescriptive teaching of CLDE children.

U. The trainee reviews the effectiveness of instructional methods implemented within the special education program for CLDE children.

V. The trainee evaluates, using appropriate measurement devices, the effectiveness of diagnostic programs for CLDE individuals.

1. Trainee examines materials, academic tasks, and methodologies using a task analysis approach.

2. Trainee examines the contributions of other resources (e.g., parents, teachers, and other school personnel).

W. The trainee evalutes the impact of prescribed treatments by means of an initial and continuing analysis of changes in academic and personal growth: e.g., trainee utilizes such data-collecting devices as questionnaires, rating scales, and checklists.

X. The trainee modifies objectives and learning approaches, provided such changes are indicated by the ongoing evaluation of educational plans.

III. Classroom Management

A. The trainee is aware of how nonverbal behaviors of both CLDE children and nonethnic teachers may lead to miscommunication between children and teachers.

B. The trainee understands and applies interaction and management strategies (e.g., behavior modification, group dynamics, interaction analysis behavior therapy, and life space management therapy) in light of cultural, socioeconomic, and language factors influencing behavior.

C. The trainee develops and applies appropriate educational methods based, in part, upon diagnostic results.

D. The trainee demonstrates a thorough knowledge of critical issues relative to effective classroom management. The following issues are suggested:

1. Effective teaching methodologies.

2. Modeling of appropriate/desirable behaviors.

3. Self-realization and values clarification.

4. Understanding of and sensitivity to physical, social, developmental, and cultural factors.

5. Emotional climate in the learning environment.

6. Teacher flexibility as demonstrated through the use of alternative activity suggestions, willingness to give explanations and reasons, and the encouragement of student input.

E. The trainee examines behavior management models or approaches and selects those appropriate to individual needs.

F. The trainee implements educational management strategies, such as: learning centers, material coding, student self-directed activities, and continuous-progress management.

G. The trainee examines educational management systems with respect to:

1. Own cultural perspective.

2. Perspective of the CLDE child.

3. Potential biases (e.g., ethnic, class, cultural, and/or linguistic).

4. Potential discriminatory effects of using a specific behavior and classroom management model.

H. The trainee extends the behavioral management program through collaborative efforts with the home, community agencies, and state and federal agencies.

IV. Counseling

A. The trainee assists parents in identifying their CLDE child's learning difficulties.

B. The trainee, with the support of parents and teachers, develops goals and objectives and prescribes special programs to meet individual needs.

C. The trainee provides parents with information on available community resources.

D. The trainee extends the behavioral management program through collaborative efforts with the home, community agencies, and state and federal agencies.

E. The trainee gathers pertinent information and provides training to the CLDE child's family, teachers, other professionals, and national, state, and local groups: e.g., trainee develops a system for ongoing technical and professional support to ancillary educational personnel.

F. The trainee assists families and their CLDE children in understanding and dealing with the attitudes, lifestyles, behaviors, and educational philosophy of American society and its schools.

V. Advocacy/Public Relations

A. The trainee understands the historical development of and legal basis for bilingual and special education. The trainee, for example, has knowledge and understanding of the following:

1. Public Law 94-142.

2. Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 504.

3. Title VII legislation.

4. Lau v. Nichols case and other pertinent legislation.

B. The trainee explains significant implications of special education regulations to students, parents, educators, and others.

C. The trainee explains the legal implications of significant court decisions on policy development and legislative reform to students, parents, educators, and others.

D. The trainee gathers pertinent information and provides training to the CLDE child's family, teachers, other professionals, and national, state, and local groups: e.g., trainee develops a system for ongoing technical and professional support to ancillary educational personnel.

E. The trainee makes suggestions to school personnel and local education agencies for implementing appropriate instructional programs which are sensitive to the needs of the CLDE child.

F. The trainee provides parents with information on available community resources.

VI. Research

A. The trainee understands all aspects of teaching CLDE children, including the recent research, etiology, content areas, educational procedure, and support systems necessary for effective educational management.

B. The trainee demonstrates knowledge of significant theory and research applications relative to teaching CLDE children by developing and implementing clinical/prescriptive activities.

CHARACTERISTICS OF CURRENT TRAINING PROGRAMS

A study conducted by the Multicultural Special Education Project (MUSEP) in 1982 collected data from 30 bilingual and/or multicultural special education teacher training projects at the university level. These projects were all located in the Western region of the United States and were funded through the Division of Personnel Preparation, Office of Special Education, U.S. Department of Education. The return rate (seven projects) was 23% (about average) and adequately represented the broad range of projects. This data provides a representative profile of bilingual special education projects in the Western region. Based on the responses to the questionnaire, each project was identified as belonging in one of three general categories:

1. A strictly traditional special education program with recruitment of ethnic or bilingual students; for example, a program that trains regular learning disability teachers but attempts to recruit minority and bilingual students.

2. A traditional special education program with bilingual special education curriculum infused into existing coursework and program requirements. This type of program, for example, would add a few lectures or modules and bibliographies on bilingual special education to existing courses.

3. A bilingual special education program that is specifically designed to train bilingual special education teachers and includes bilingual special education course work and field experiences with bilingual special education curriculum.

Analysis of the data indicates that 29% were strictly traditional special education programs that recruited minority students at most; 29% were traditional special education programs with bilingual special education infused into existing curricula; and 42% were bilingual special education programs that offered specific courses in bilingual special education and considered their program a bilingual special education program.

Table 1 summarizes the information on program types and shows the number of graduates for each of the programs.

TABLE 1
Program Types and Their Respective Graduates

Projects	Strictly Traditional Special Ed. Program With Recruitment of Ethnic Students	Traditional Special Ed. With Bilingual Special Ed. Infused Info. Existing Courses	Bilingual Special Education Program	Number of Students Graduated		
				B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D.
1			X	5	-	-
2		X		5	1	-
3		X		2	-	2
4	X			15	1	55
5	X			20	5	25
6			X	6	-	-
7			X	-	-	-
Total %	29%	29%	42%			

Traditional special education programs graduated the most students in each of the three training levels (BA - 35, MA - 6, PhD - 84), followed by infused traditional special education programs (BA - 7, MA - 1, PhD - 2). The low number of graduates from bilingual special education programs (BA - 11) indicates the relatively recent emergence of the field. More importantly, it points to the need for continued support of this specialized field. In terms of the degree of interdisciplinary emphasis in the curriculum, 86% of the students in all projects sampled were exposed to some ethnic language component (e.g., Spanish, Navajo, etc.); 71% were exposed to cultural sensitivity or awareness coursework (e.g., Asian or Chicano Studies); 57% were exposed to specific bilingual special education methodology; and 43% had interdisciplinary exchange with bilingual education.

It was stated that there is a general trend toward deemphasis of education by state and federal funding agencies. Without adequate resources it is very difficult to recruit students. It also appears that some faculty consider it necessary to deemphasize entrance standards and stress exit criteria in order to recruit and retain students. The problem is compounded because of the small pool of high school graduates from which to draw.

Public school support for bilingual special education programs is also a problem. Many indicated that public schools in some areas do not support bilingual special education efforts by higher education institutions. Nonetheless, the public schools lack trained professionals in bilingual special education. University training programs need to be strengthed in order to attract students and help relieve this shortage of personnel. There is also a critical need to infuse teacher training programs with a bilingual special education content. This also involves increasing faculty awareness and support. Clarifying the interface between bilingual education and special education is a high priority.

In the area of research basic knowledge is needed about target populations, e.g., American Indians, Hispanics, and Asians. Specifically, more information is needed about their culture, language, and cognitive development. It was agreed that more knowledge is needed concerning what constitutes a positive learning atmosphere for children being serviced through bilingual special education. Research is needed on effective teacher training models for bilingual special education.

In the area of program development, it was emphasized that there should be a coordinated effort on the part of bilingual special education training programs and school districts to communicate with state personnel, to make known the needs of bilingual special education in the schools. This should encourage institutionalization and help secure funding at both levels. In order to achieve meaningful local control, it was stressed that IHE's, school boards, school administrators, teachers, bilingual teachers, bilingual special education teachers, parents, and the general public all need to be sensitized to the issue and need for bilingual special education programs that reflect local needs.

Bilingual special education teacher trainers need to be knowledgeable about bilingual/bicultural and special education, in addition to being versed in bilingual special education per se. For example, teacher trainers should be "equipped" to use culturally and linguistically appropriate special education assessment procedures with non-English-speaking culturally and linguistically different exceptional students (CLDES). It is extremely important that bilingual special education trainers and programs maintain and increase communication among themselves. Communication will enhance camaraderie, program support, avoid duplication of mistakes and efforts in research, and will keep morale up in these times of scarce resources.

The existing heterogeneity among bilingual special education projects is an asset that can aid us in our search for successful project components. Recognized is the fact that these evaluations will not turn up an ideal project that will be suited for all regions and ethnic groups.

Finally, it was stressed that there is a need to begin to make specific efforts to institutionalize projects that are dependent on grants, i.e., soft monies. In order to do this, four things should be emphasized: cause awareness, acceptance, participation, and demonstration of the effectiveness and need of bilingual special education projects.

Additional data on these teacher training projects was acquired through site visits to the projects as well as through personal communication. Table 2 summarizes the major concerns and the recurring needs expressed by the project directors.

As can be seen in Table 2, the most common concern among all projects was the institutionalization of their training programs. Fifty-nine percent of the projects expressed some concern that they would cease to exist unless adopted by their institutions and departments and made permanent programs.

A second most recurrent concern among the 17 projects was student recruitment and support. Forty-nine percent of the projects felt there were not enough minority students in their programs and had problems recruiting them. Moreover, some projects felt a need to provide academic and general support to the few minorities that were already in the programs.

Table 2 indicates that 35% of the projects felt they needed the support and cooperation of academic and nonacademic departments, programs, and agencies, such as special education departments, state departments, LEA's, school districts, and community groups. Twenty-four percent felt bilingual special education programs needed better planning and development. Another 24% of the projects felt a need to infuse bilingual special education curricula into existing course of existing and institutionalized training programs, such as special and bilingual education programs.

Table 2
Needs and Concerns Generated From Site Visits

Percentage	Expressed Need
59%*	Program institutionalization.
49%	Student recruitment and support (e.g., tutoring).
35%	Program support and cooperation with departments, programs, and agencies (e.g., state departments, LEA's, school districts, and communities).
24%	Program planning and development.
24%	Infusion of bilingual special education curricula into existing courses.
18%	Faculty and teacher inservice training: models and content.
18%	Research and development of reliable and valid diagnostic instruments in bilingual special education.
18%	Method and curricula identification, dissemination, and development appropriate for bilingual special education.
12%	Basic research emphasis.

*Many institutions had more than one concern.

Eighteen percent felt that models and content of inservice training for faculty and teachers are important and in need of development. Yet another 18% felt there is a need in bilingual special education to research and develop reliable and valid diagnostic instruments that are sensitive to culturally and linguistically different populations. Still another 18% of the projects felt a need to identify, disseminate, and develop teaching methods and curricula appropriate for teachers to use in the area of bilingual special education. Finally, 12% of the projects felt that the area of bilingual special education needs to be involved and should serve as a catalyst for basic empirical research.

PROGRAM PLANNING AND INSTITUTIONALIZATION

To "institutionalize" a newly establish or nontraditional program like bilingual special education in higher education means to make it a regular part of the program offerings of a college or university. The

institutionalization process is never automatic; to accomplish it, a strategy or plan of action, frequently extending over several years, is required. If a strategy is to have reasonable probability of success, careful attention must be given to meeting five conditions. If these conditions are not met, the probability of a successful plan is substantially reduced. These conditions are described below from the viewpoint of the person interested in institutionalizing a program.

Develop Central Office Administrative Support

Central offices serve as communication centers and as the locus of control of dollar and personnel resources. These resources tend to flow along the line of communication. For this reason, the director of a nontraditional program needs to have numerous interactions with the head of his or her unit. These meetings should be open to any topic related to the new program, including personnel matters, political issues, student support, long-term directions, publications, needed contracts, whether or not to pursue grant opportunities, presentations at national meetings, and the financial condition of the department and school. Such interactions have two important outcomes. First, each person leaves the meeting with a good sense of what is happening in the other person's domain. Second, incipient problems are dealt with before they occur, thus leading to better management.

Pay Attention to Political Circumstances

Many programs, especially those involving bilingualism and ethnic groups, are very sensitive to shifts in viewpoint or power within the university, the state, or the nation. For this reason, keeping one's political support in repair is an important aspect of institutionalizing a program. Three types of support are significant here: (a) grass roots including parents, teachers, and school administrators; (b) power block, including subgroups of legislators or congressional representatives, and th support of state or federal agencies; and (c) support from other disciplines. These three groups must be kept well informed. In a university, the good will of other departments is critically important to survival and success. In the bilingual/multicultural special education area, forming solid relationships with foreign language departments, linguistics, sociolinguistics, anthropology, and speech science permits them to know what the program is doing and what the major concerns and goals are, and prevents feelings of suspicion and interdepartmental hostility frequently found in colleges and universities when nontraditional programs arise.

The art of politics is finding a common value among groups such as those mentioned above. It is not always easy to do so since each political group is likely to form a set of values different from the other. That, one supposes, is what a "political group" means. To find a common value means that one must spend sufficient time with each type of group to be able to form several ideas about where the common ground among them might lie, should political action be required. While time

consuming, the task of finding a common value is frequently a critical one for the director and staff of a nontraditional program like bilingual special education.

Find or Develop a Niche for the Program and Its Faculty

To feel secure in an organization, most persons need to have a home base or a special niche in the organization from which they can carry on their activities. The same seems to be true of programs. To develop a niche for a nontraditional program and its faculty is one of the most difficult tasks in institutionalization. To gain a niche, several important events need to occur between the central office, the appropriate academic unit, and the program. The first is the establishment of an academically sound and supportive academic base in an appropriate academic department or division. Not only must there be a good academic fit between the program and the department, but there should be a faculty support for the program from colleagues within the department. The second is identifying a carefully located space which is the visible office of the program, as space is the symbol of institutionalization. Third is developing program uniqueness. These issues are raised by a traditional program currently facing phase-out. One of its major problems is that the content of the program has, over the years, begun to appear in other programs, thus gradually reducing the uniqueness of the original program. People have asked, "What does this program do that is not done in other programs?" If this question is difficult to answer, either a program has never gained a niche or it is in danger of losing the one formerly occupied.

Consolidate Resources and Monitor Their Status Often

All college and university programs need three types of resources: faculty, students, and money. To consolidate faculty resources means that the faculty members involved in the program identify with it and are reliable in the sense that they will expend effort to improve the program rather than directing their attention elsewhere. To consolidate faculty resources requires the systematic application of leadership skills by the program director so that the faculty involved believe that their work is important, that it will be rewarded, and that the program has direction and social value.

The consolidation of student resources represents one of the most difficult problems of nontraditional programs. A key factor in the durability of federally sponsored programs for Hispanic and Native American peoples, for example, is that many of the funds are directly devoted to student support. Economically disadvantaged persons in these groups often cannot easily opt for higher education since doing so involves foregoing the money that would be gained from full-time employment while at the same time having to pay for more schooling. A subsidy, typically from federal sources, is therefore required if programs for these people are to have students. A withdrawal of this subsidy predicts program failure by dint of insufficient students from the target populations. Maintenance of direct federal or state subsidies for students is, therefore, a central reason for the development and

maintenance of majority-minority political ties by minority group members. The major alternative to direct subsidies is the adaptation of nontraditional programs to the circumstances of its target population of students. This adaptation usually means a part-time program in which students can enroll during the evening and may include the use of teleconference instruction in which courses or workshops are delivered to remote areas at time convenient for students.

The consolidation of financial resources usually requires two moves. First, be certain a significant portion of the program faculty are on "hard" rather than "soft" money. Faculty on hard money is usually taken as a significant sign of successful institutionalization. Second, regular ways of raising money by grants, gifts, consulting, or contracts should be planned by the program faculty. Such funds frequently make the difference between a quality program and one chronically on the brink of financial disaster.

Build a Sound Program

The first step in building a sound program is to avoid slipshod admission practices. A program is known by the quality of its graduates. If one admits slow students on the one hand or purely opportunistic ones on the other, it will become suspect both inside and outside the college or university. Placement will become difficult. The second step is to build a rational curriculum. Such a curriculum has two important features: a) It can be described and explained in the sense that the faculty can show how the curriculum is related to the goals and objectives of the program, and b) the curriculum actually produces a reasonable level of the skills, knowledges, and intellectual strategies which the program claims that it produces. The third step is to bridge the special program to the regular faculty and curriculum by formal as well as informal mechanisms. The curriculum should not be too highly specialized and should have anchors in both special and bilingual education. The fourth step is to hold an experimental and evaluative posture toward the curriculum. Every program can be designed to be better than it is. An experimental posture means that one forms hypotheses about changes that will improve the program, and carries them out. An evaluative posture means that the effects of these changes are carefully appraised to make certain they actually produce improvements in the program. A systems approach to program evaluation is recommended.

As the five conditions described above suggest, institutionalizing a program is neither an easy nor a certain process. Creating a strategy or action plan substantially increases the probability of success, while not doing so leaves one's chances to luck.

MODEL TRAINING PROGRAMS

There are two general approaches that can be used in addressing the need to prepare bilingual special education teachers. Existing teacher training faculty and programs in special education and bilingual education can consolidate their resources and service their programs to

focus on the unique needs of exceptional bilingual students. This is currently being done by several universities throughout the country, as mentioned earlier in this paper. Another approach is to focus attention on the training of the trainers themselves. At the preservice doctoral level, a few universities are working with doctoral students on an ad hoc basis. These programs use existing doctoral training programs in special education and add an emphasis in bilingual special education through independent studies, specialized seminars, internships, and related research projects. Among the universities involved in this type of leadership training are The University of Arizona, Arizona State University, San Diego State University, The University of Colorado, The University of New Mexico, New Mexico State University, The University of Massachusetts, Boston University, New York University, and New York State University.

The Multicultural Institute for Change

In addition to such preservice training for faculty, Landurand (1982) has developed a very successful inservice training model for college and university faculty in the area of bilingual special education. Through a U. S. Department of Education special education dean's grant, Landurand established the Multicultural Institute for Change at Regis College in Weston, Massachusetts. The Institute's primary goal is to improve the quality of service to linguistically and culturally different children. Currently, the Institute is training 16 faculty members from six nearby colleges and universities in the theory and practical application of bilingual special education. The following program description is taken from a publication of the Multicultural Institute for Change (Landurand, 1982).

The instructional program of the Institute for Change consists of five major components: theoretical modular training, a local educational agency, practicum experience, a college practicum experience, and an integrative seminar. For each of the three years, the faculty trainees complete three modules: the correlated local school or agency practice, the college practicum, and the integrative seminar. Prior to initiating any of the components, each faculty trainee, with the assistance of the project staff, undergoes a diagnostic prescriptive assessment. Each trainee analyzes his or her particular areas of expertise, background in bilingual/bicultural issues, and favored learning style. In addition, for each of the tasks specified in the college component, the trainee evaluates what he or she has done in that area and develops objectives from a multicultural perspective for self-improvement for achieving that goal. Once these assessments are completed, each trainee, with the help of the Project Director and part-time staff, develops an individual training plan (ITP) to accomplish each of the components developed in the Institute for Change. Techniques such as individual and school case studies; role playing; group problem solving; and on-site local school, agency, and college practicum are utilized in training.

At the end of the 3-year project, the Regis College Institute for Change will provide insights as to the strategies necessary for successful training of faculty members in the content of bilingual/bicultural special education. To date, the Institute staff can suggest the following to other institutions that might consider such training:

1. Involve the administrative staff from the beginning of the project. Without the support of the deans, the Institute for Change would not be able to expect high levels of commitment from faculty.

2. Offer training sessions that do not conflict with faculty members' busy schedules. In most cases, "retreats" provide faculty with the opportunity to concentrate on the issues and skills relative to bilingual/bicultural special education.

3. Provide experiences in the public schools and community in order to update faculty's perceptions of the needs of linguistic minorities in the local educational agencies.

4. Be prepared to deal with attitudes faculty members may bring to the training that reflect their perceptions of individuals from culturally different backgrounds. Staff members and consultants should have skills in group processes, especially as these skills relate to racism and biases that faculty may consciously or unconsciously possess.

5. Provide ongoing follow-up with faculty and administrative staff. Because faculty have many responsibilities, their completion of ITP's may be difficult without the constant support of the project's staff and consultants.

Because of the immediate need to train bilingual special education teachers the above mentioned model is highly recommended both as a short-term strategy and as a strategy for colleges and universities who wish to retrain existing faculty.

Bilingual Language Learning System (BLLS)

Another significant and model inservice training program has been undertaken by the American Speech, Language, and Hearing Association (ASHA). This project is also funded by the Office of Special Education of the U. S. Department of Education. The project is known as the Bilingual Language Learning System (BLLS). The description of the program which follows was adapted from the project summary disseminated by ASHA.

The Bilingual Language Learning System (BLLS) project has been designed as a national coordinated effort to meet this need and to improve the availability and quality of speech-language pathology and audiology services rendered to bilingual/bicultural Spanish-English children. Funded August 1, 1981, by Special Education Programs, United States Department of Education, the BLLS project is intended to provide a series of 2-day inservice training institutes and a training manual which

discuss characteristics of Spanish and English language acquisition; how speech-language pathologists and audiologists may provide appropriate evaluation of Spanish-English children with suspected communication handicaps; how effective management strategies can be implemented for those children with confirmed language disorders; and how interaction of speech-language pathologists and audiologists with other school professionals can be promoted in order to increase the effectiveness of educational programming for this population.

During the course of the project, a model of training will be employed in which bilingual/bicultural speech-language pathologists will be trained to train other professionals. In addition, representatives of university/college training programs in speech-language pathology and audiology will be trained so that content of BLLS Institutes can be incorporated into university/college program curricula. State schools consultants will also be trained so that these resource persons can disseminate information on the BLSS Institutes and effect improved education for Spanish-English children. The Trainers, university/college representatives and school consultants, have been selected for the eight states which, collectively, account for nearly 90% of the Spanish-language population in the United States (Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, New Mexico, New York, and Texas). These individuals compose BLLS State Resource Teams in the eight target states.

During the first year of the project (August 1981 through May 1982), the BLLS training manual was developed and the State Resource Team members were selected. During the second year of the project (June 1982 through May 1983), the Trainers conducted a series of 14 BLLS Institutes for Hispanic bilingual and bilcultural speech-language pathologists, audiologists, and other Hispanic professionals who worked in teams with speech-language pathologists and audiologists, and selected a second group of Trainers for the project. During the third year of the project (June 1983 through May 1984), this second group were trained as Trainers and conducted a series of 22 BLLS Institutes for monolingual professionals. Training for bilingual/bicultural speech-language pathologists and audiologists will be distinct from training for monolingual individuals because the professional needs of the two groups are different.

The Institutes will serve to:

- Disseminate state-of-the-art information regarding bilingual communication assessment and treatment to professionals working with Spanish-English children.

- Provide opportunities for Trainers to develop their skills in presenting the curriculum content.

- Field-test the original curriculum content so that necessary revision, based on evaluation by Institute participants, can be made.

As a result of BLLS training, it is anticipated that more speech-language pathologists and audiologists will provide improved services to bilingual/bicultural communicatively handicapped children. Greater consultative services will then be available to special and regular educators, and these professionals will better understand contributions that communication disorders specialists can provide.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Preservice training projects in bilingual special education should be given increased support from the local, state, and federal level.

2. Colleges and universities should cooperate with local school districts in conducting a planned and systematic inservice program in bilingual special education.

3. Leadership training in bilingual special education at the doctoral level should receive increased support from the U. S. Department of Education.

4. All types and levels of bilingual special education training should include a strong emphasis on parental involvement and parent training.

5. Bilingual special education teacher training curricula should be highly interdisciplinary in orientation, drawing not only from special education and bilingual education but from psychology, anthropology, linguistics, psycholinguistics, language departments, etc.

6. Bilingual special education teacher competencies identified as critical by practitioners should be validated empirically before being used to design future training programs.

7. Bilingual special education teacher training research should be conducted with particular emphasis given to student outcomes as the ultimate measure of success.

8. Teacher training materials and textbooks as well as bibliographies should be developed for the field of bilingual special education.

9. Training programs should make special provisions for student recruitment and retention. Stipends, tuition and book allowances, and additional support systems should also be provided.

10. Bilingual special education and ESL methods courses should be unique and different for this population of exceptional bilingual students.

11. The issue of dual (special education and bilingual education) endorsement and certification as well as bilingual special education endorsement and certification needs further study.

12. The training of regular education teachers through infusion regarding the needs of the bilingual exceptional child is a priority.

REFERENCES

American Association of Colleges in Teacher Education (AACTE). (1973). No one model American, Journal of Teacher Education, 24, 264.

Grossman, H. (1982). Bilingual special education teacher training. Summary of the Proceedings of the Bilingual Special Education Institute. Boulder CO: BUENO Center for Multicultural Education.

Landurand, P. (1982). Training Faculty in Bilingual Special Education, Regis College Multicultural Institute for Change.

MUSEP. (1982). A Report on Bilingual Special Education Teacher Training Programs, BUENO Center for Multicultural Education.

National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). (1980). The condition of education. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Pynn, E. (1981). Bilingual Special Education Personnel Preparation National Teacher Oriented Seminar, ACCESS Inc.